



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tional government. It was charged against them that they are too militaristic, and that they are wholly inadequate in the light of the war in Europe, which should be stopped. Mr. John Bassett Moore pointed out the difficulty of ascertaining who begins wars, and expressed the wish to be disassociated from the view that the resolutions providing for the use of force are capable of easy application. A motion was made that the name proposed be changed to "A League to Establish and Maintain Peace." It was further moved that the third resolution calling for the employment of military and economic force be cut out.

In spite of these objections and motions, the majority agreed that the whole object of the conference was to set loose those energies thought by most of those present to be necessary for the enforcement of peace. Such application of force, it was argued, would operate as a backfire in case of war, and by condemnation and threat prevent many useless wars.

Lessons were drawn from the Grand Alliance, the Quadruple Alliance, the Holy Alliance, and from the Concert of Europe. The failure of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente to furnish the protection for which they were organized was attributed to narrowness and incompetence as a means of establishing justice. Recognizing that the dangers of a great league are from within and of a smaller league from without, Prof. John Bates Clark said epigrammatically: "Pacifism judicial plus pacifism protective equals pacifism successful and enduring." It was pointed out that natural forces stronger than governments are making for a league of peace, in the creation of which neutral States are to have an opportunity to aid at the close of the war, and it is true that the time is now at hand for America to study the possibilities presented by the Alliance and Entente already at hand, and of a possible co-operation with such neutral countries.

Our personal feeling is that the delegates overemphasized the need of an international force. When we agree to concentrate upon the International Legislature and upon the International Court, long contended for and all but complete, we shall find little difference of opinion, indeed a far more generous and intelligent support. If after these two means of establishing international justice are adequately provided it is found necessary to organize an international police, we shall, of course, by all means organize it. There are many of us, however, who believe that the logic of history warrants us to conclude that the Congress and High Court of Nations, when once fully established, will make an international police force unnecessary. At least we hold that prolonged discussions in defense of an international police are at this time unnecessary and harmful. The Philadelphia program, therefore, will yet have

to be amended in accordance with Professor Kirchwey's suggestion,—the name of the organization changed, and the section providing for the use of force omitted. The program is, however, three-fourths sane and hopeful.

Our National Security.

If it were possible to divide the American people into militarists and pacifists we would say that both are most keenly alive to the problem the American Peace Society has been trying to make clear for nearly a century. Hysteria is familiarly charged against each party, and with some appropriateness in each instance. The militarists are no more in accord among themselves than are the pacifists. Our opinion is that the number of military programs is larger than the number of peace programs. The reassuring thing about them all is that they are for the most part harmless and irresponsible. As an evidence of a growing intelligence in our democracy, they are extremely hopeful. Out of the clash and war of words this democracy of ours will yet come unto its own. America will stand unitedly at last for a substitute for war, and that in terms of an international legislature and an international court. What appear now as irreconcilable differences will then essentially pass away, for we shall then have established our real and only national security.

The National Security League and Preparedness for War.

The meeting of the National Security League, called "A Conference of Peace and Preparation," met at New York city June 14 and 15. Several of those who took part in the conference are members of peace societies, but most of the speakers were opposed to the pacifists. Various programs providing for additions year by year to the army and navy were presented. There was, however, little unity or agreement in the plans proposed. Congressman Parker, evidently a close student of the whole matter, declared that he wanted no battleships whatever. He conceived our need to be more rifles and ammunition. There was little evidence that any competent individual or army man had been consulted with reference to our military need. Unpleasant personalities crept into some of the speeches, in some cases becoming reproach and ridicule. Several speakers paid an unconscious tribute to the peace movement by declaring that the propaganda of the last five years had educated the people to the point where they are opposed to an increase of armaments. It was said with some bitterness that the nation is becoming soft and effeminate in consequence.

A representative of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE who at-